



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/080,870	02/22/2002	Mikhail Godkin	2102483-906310	9808
29585	7590	07/16/2003		
GRAY CARY WARE & FREIDENRICH LLP 153 TOWNSEND SUITE 800 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94107			EXAMINER MOHANDESI, IRAJ A	
			ART UNIT 2834	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 07/16/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/080,870	GODKIN, MIKHAIL
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Iraj A Mohandes	2834

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 February 2002.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 22 February 2002 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 10. 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because they fail to show "two different size magnets in structure connecting free ends of the magnets" as described in the specification. Any structural detail that is essential for a proper understanding of the disclosed invention should be shown in the drawing. MPEP § 608.02(d). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. **Claims 1-3,5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Shinichhayashi JP patent 62-173968.**

Shinichhayashi discloses a moving coil actuator in the prior art comprising a first magnet (30, left, Fig.1,2) having a length a second magnet (30 R, Fig.1,2) having a length a first soft magnetic pole piece (3R, Fig1,2) having a length greater than the

length of the first magnet and the length of the second magnet(3L, Fig.1,2), wherein the first and second magnets are positioned at different ends of the first soft magnetic pole piece and magnetized in opposite directions (see Fig.2 magnets 30R and 30L are disposed in different ends) a coil (2, Fig.1,2,3) having a length less than the lengths of the first soft magnetic pole piece and positioned for travel along an axis common to the first soft magnetic pole piece and a structure which provides a magnetic path between free ends of the first and second magnet (see. Fig.2), the length of the first magnet is substantially the same as the length of the second magnet (see Fig. 30r has same length as 30L).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Shinichhayashi in view of ordinary skill in the art.

Shinichhayashi discloses a moving coil actuator in the prior art comprising a first magnet (30, left, Fig.1,2) having a length a second magnet (30 R, Fig.1,2) having a length a first soft magnetic pole piece (3R, Fig1,2) having a length greater than the length of the first magnet and the length of the second magnet(3L, Fig.1,2), wherein the first and second magnets are positioned at different ends of the first soft magnetic pole piece and magnetized in opposite directions (see Fig.2 magnets 30R and 30L are

disposed in different ends) a coil (2, Fig.1,2,3) having a length less than the lengths of the first soft magnetic pole piece and positioned for travel along an axis common to the first soft magnetic pole piece and a structure which provides a magnetic path between free ends of the first and second magnet (see. Fig.2), the length of the first magnet is substantially the same as the length of the second magnet (see Fig. 30r has same length as 30L).

However **Shinichhayashi** teaches all limitation of the claimed invention except only the length of the first magnet is substantially twice the length of the second magnet. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the motor of **Shinichhayashi** with magnet has substantially twice the length of the second magnet to optimize the flux f the motor ,since it has been held that where the general condition of a claim disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable range involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

Communication

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Iraj A Mohandes whose telephone number is (703)305-3242. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nestor Ramirez can be reached on 703-308-1371. The fax phone numbers

Art Unit: 2834

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)872-9314
for regular communications and (703)872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or
proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)306-
0377.

IM
July 14, 2003



KARL TAMAI
PRIMARY EXAMINER